



# COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES  
600 East Broad Street, Suite 1300  
Richmond, VA 23219

October 8, 2008

## ADDENDUM No. 5 TO VENDORS:

Reference Request for Proposal: RFP 2008-02

Dated: August 13, 2008

Due: November 14, 2008

Below are updates that may delete, add, modify or clarify certain aspects of the aforementioned RFP. Please incorporate as necessary.

**Page 2-15 §2.3, Offeror Profile, first paragraph top of page:**  
**REVISION – Paragraph revised to read per the following:**

In addition, Offeror is asked to provide a synopsis or case study of results attributable to its commitment to high quality and increased operating efficiency. This is requested to demonstrate the added value the Offeror can offer and indicate the ~~typical ongoing~~ **past** cost reductions and solution efficiencies ~~DMAS could expect to realize~~ **that the Offeror has accomplished.**

**Page 2-15 thru Page 2-18, §2.3 Offeror Profile, Service and Support Management:**  
**DELETE – Delete this section in its entirety.**

**Page 3-5 §3.4.1 Platforms, Table 3.4.1, 7<sup>th</sup> Row of Table, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> Columns:**  
**CHANGE – Change Diagram Ref #, Make/Model, and Operating System information per the following:**

|      |   |  |                                    |                                   |    |   |
|------|---|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|---|
| 9-13 | <del>IBM Unix</del><br><del>System P5</del><br><del>510Q</del><br><del>(1)</del><br>Intel Based<br>(2)<br><br>(1) CPU 3.2 GHz<br>RAM <del>3.5</del> 3.6 GB<br>Storage <del>12</del> 383 GB<br>(2) CPU 3.2 GHz<br>RAM 3.6 GB<br>Storage 198 GB | <del>IBM AIX</del><br><del>Version</del><br><del>5.3.0.0</del><br>Microsoft<br>Windows<br>200X<br>Server | Remedy<br>Version<br>6.3 w/patch20 | Development<br>Test<br>Production | 77 | Custom Remedy application<br>used to support CM DMAS,<br>Information Service<br>Requests (ISRs) Tracking<br>System. |
|------|---|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|---|

**Appendix A.II: Service Level Methodology, Page A.II – 4, Item E. Continuous Improvement, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence:**

**REVISION – Sentence revised to read per the following:**

Beginning 12 months after the implementation of Service Level Credits on July 1, 2010 and on each annual anniversary thereof, the Parties shall **review and** adjust **as necessary** the Minimum Performance Level for each Service Level so that the Improvement Adjustment for each Service Level is calculated as (the average of the six (6) highest or best monthly actual results that are above or better than the Minimum Performance Level during the preceding twelve (12) months minus the current Minimum Performance Level) multiplied by 20%.

**Appendix E.I, Page E.I – 13, #68:**

**DELETE – Delete the word “software” from bullet one (see below).**

|     |   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
| 68. | <p>Does the Offeror agree to provide EDI technical and customer support for DMAS, service centers, and other stakeholders to include the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide a <del>software</del> test environment that allows for end-to-end testing with potential trading partners;</li><li>• Test and implement updated versions of software as updates become available;</li><li>• Provide a toll-free number and e-mail support to providers, service centers, DMAS, and other stakeholders;</li><li>• Provide support staff during normal business hours;</li><li>• Provide and maintain documentation posted on the DMAS Medicaid Web portal for EDI enrollment, environment access, and transaction transmission policies and procedures for service centers, including companion guides that supplement standard implementation guides;</li><li>• Assist service centers with file transfers, enrollment, testing, and authorization activities; and</li><li>• Follow-up with service centers that receive compliance errors and assist as needed with identifying any problems and corrections?</li></ul> <p>Describe the approach.</p> |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|

**Appendix E.I, Page E.I – 35, #160:**

**REMOVE AND REPLACE – Delete Requirement #160 and replace per the following:**

|      |   |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|
| 160. | <p><del>Does the Offeror agree to provide DMAS with a Takeover organization chart including a named project manager for the Takeover Phase?</del></p> <p><b>Does the Offeror agree as part of the proposal, to provide DMAS with a Takeover organization chart including a named certified Project Manager Professional (PMP), a resume and three references?</b></p> |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|

**Appendix E.I, Page E.I – 35, #163:**

**REMOVE AND REPLACE – Delete Requirement #163 and replace per the following:**

|      |   |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|
| 163. | <del>Does the Offeror agree to follow the Commonwealth's project management standard ITRM-CPM-112-02 determined and communicated by DMAS and to provide a PMI-certified project manager?</del><br><b>Does the Offeror agree to follow the Commonwealth Project Manager Standards ITRM-CPM-112-02?</b> |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|

**Appendix E.II, Table E-3, Page E.II – 6:**

**ADD – Additional wording added to sentence under “Definition” (see below)**

**Table E-3. MMIS General Availability Service Levels**

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>DEFINITION</b> | MMIS General Availability is defined as the applications and technical infrastructure availability to support mission critical business processing and functions <b>and excludes scheduled maintenance.</b> |
|-------------------|---|

**Appendix E.II, Table E-3, Page E.II – 6:**

**ADD – Additional wording added at end of Performance Target description for ID 1 (see below).**

|   |   |                        |   |       |
|---|---|------------------------|---|-------|
| 1 | Medicaid Enterprise production availability to users during posted hours. | Aggregate Availability | <p>General Inquiry and Update Mode:<br/>Mon-Fri, 06:15-2000<br/>Sat, 06:15-1700</p> <p>General Inquiry only mode:<br/>Available in this mode when not in the “General Inquiry and Update Mode” less system maintenance window.</p> <p>Inquiry and Update Mode for Pharmacy Point of Sale:<br/>Sun-Sat, 0000-2400</p> <p><b>Inquiry Mode for Medicaid Web Portal (ARS, etc) and Medical:<br/>Sun-Sat, 0000-2400</b></p> <p><b>Scheduled System Maintenance:<br/>Sun-Sat, 0200 (2 AM)</b></p> | 99.5% |
|---|---|------------------------|---|-------|

**Appendix E.II, Table E-3, Page E.II – 6:**

**CHANGE – Change “Minimum Performance %” from 99.8% to 99.5% in Row 2 For “Test and development environment availability to MMIS development staff”(see below).**

|   |  |                        |                     |                |
|---|--|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 2 | Test and development environment availability to MMIS development staff. | Aggregate Availability | Sun-Sat, 0000-2400. | 99.8%<br>99.5% |
|---|--|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|

**Appendix E.II, Table E-7, Page E.II – 13:**

**CHANGE – Under item #14, Performance Target, Change 48 hours to 2 business days (see below).**

|    |  |          |  |      |
|----|--|----------|--|------|
| 14 | Return all paper payment requests with missing key fields. | Response | Returned ≤ <del>48 hours</del> <b>2 business days</b> after receipt. | 100% |
|----|--|----------|--|------|

**Appendix F.I, Page F.I-12, #60:**

**REMOVE AND REPLACE – Delete Requirement #60 and replace per the following:**

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 60. | <del>Does the Offeror agree to follow the Commonwealth's project management methodology ITRM-CPM-112-02 as determined and communicated by DMAS and provide a project manager?</del><br><b>Does the Offeror agree to follow the Commonwealth Project Manager Standards ITRM-CPM-112-02?</b> |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|

**Appendix F.I, Page F.I – 13, #65:**

**REMOVE AND REPLACE – Delete Requirement #65 and replace per the following:**

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 65. | <del>Does the Offeror agree to provide DMAS with a Takeover Organization chart including a named project manager for the Takeover Phase?</del><br><b>Does the Offeror agree as part of the proposal, to provide DMAS with a Takeover organization chart including a named experienced project manager, a resume, and three references?</b> |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|

**Appendix G.I, Page G.I – 9, #78:**

**REMOVE AND REPLACE – Delete Requirement #78 and replace per the following:**

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 78. | <del>Does the Offeror agree to follow the Commonwealth's project management methodology ITRM-CPM-112-02 as determined and communicated by DMAS and provide a project manager?</del><br><b>Does the Offeror agree to follow the Commonwealth Project Manager Standards ITRM-CPM-112-02?</b> |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|

**Appendix G.I, Page G.I – 9, #80:**

**REMOVE AND REPLACE – Delete Requirement #80 and replace per the following:**

|     |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|
| 80. | <del>Does the Offeror agree to provide DMAS with a Takeover Organization chart including a named project manager for the Takeover Phase?</del><br><b>Does the Offeror agree as part of the proposal, to provide DMAS with a Takeover organization chart including a named experienced project manager, a resume, and three references?</b> |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|

**See Attachment 1 for list of additional questions posed by Offerors and the Department of Medical Assistance Services response.**

Please Note: Some questions may take additional time in order to generate an adequate response. If you do not see a response to a question you have submitted, please monitor the DMAS and eVA website for future addendums.

Note: A signed acknowledgment of this addendum must be received by this office either prior to the due date and hour required or attached to your proposal response. Signature on this addendum does not substitute for your signature on the original proposal document. The original proposal document must be signed.

Sincerely,

*Christopher M. Banaszak*

DMAS Contract Manager

Name of Firm: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature and Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

| <b>DMAS #</b> | <b>Vendor</b> | <b>RFP Cite</b>        | <b>Vendor Question</b>  | <b>DMAS Response</b>  |
|---------------|---------------|------------------------|---|---|
| 153           | BCBSSC        | 2.1.9<br>(p. 2-3)      | <p>Paragraph 5 states, "The Offeror must provide as a separate appendix to its proposal a list of all pages in the proposal and a specific identification of the data or materials to be protected and the reason it deems such information proprietary."</p> <p>In preparing our response to the RFP, should we place the appendix referring to proprietary information in the "Contractor's Optional Appendices to Proposal" Section referenced on RFP Table 2.2, Requirement 2.2 Proposal Format for CD-ROM No. 1? If not, where should we place it?</p> | Required appendix should be included under "Detailed Description of Proposed Solution(s)" section, CD-ROM No.1, referenced on RFP Table 2.2           |
| 154           | CSC           | Table 2.2<br>(p. 2-11) | Table 2.2 on page 2-11 includes the statement: "Any comments in the form of a redline markup for Service Level Agreements for E.II, F.II or G.II must be included, as well." Does DMAS desire that an offeror's pricing reflect the SLAs as redlined by the offeror?  | Yes.  |
| 155           | EDS           | 2.3<br>(p. 2-15)       | <p>Requirement 2.3 states: In addition, Offeror is asked to provide a synopsis or case study of results attributable to its commitment to high quality and increased operating efficiency. This is requested to demonstrate the added value the Offeror can offer and indicate the typical ongoing cost reductions and solution efficiencies DMAS could expect to realize.</p> <p>Should we answer this in percentages of ongoing cost reductions because, according to requirements, no pricing is to be included in this section of the proposal?</p>     | DMAS will correct the statement. DMAS' intent was to review past experiences based on a synopsis or case study, not to give ongoing cost information. |

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                               |  |   |
|-----|-----|-------------------------------|--|---|
| 156 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-4)             | What is the mainframe DASD hardware model and vendor?  | EMC – currently, there are 2 EMC 8530 escon 8gb cache, but will be migrating to a new EMC DMX1000 FICON model with 9.5TB capacity by end of month October. The DASD capacity supports multiple accounts.  |
| 157 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-4)             | What is the mainframe monthly tape utilization in GBs?   | Tape utilization is not measured in GBs. Only tape mounts are measured.   |
| 158 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-4)             | What is the mainframe tape hardware model and vendor?  | STK/IBM – 3490E – Currently a VSM3 virtual tape system exists with 64 virtual drives, which has reached its end of service life. It will be upgraded to a VSM4 FICON system with 256 virtual drives, including 9840D , 9840C RTD LSM, before the end of the year. 9840s can hold 40 GB of data. |
| 159 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-4)             | What are the number of DB2 subsystems in the mainframe environment?  | There are currently two (2) DB2 environments, DBP1 for Production and DBT1 for Development and Testing.   |
| 160 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-4)             | Can we assume that there are no other interactive software systems running in the mainframe environment beyond CICS and DB2? If others are present, please identify.   | No, others include Princeton Softech for DB2 & Log Analyzer for DB2 and SYSB-II by H&W Systems.   |
| 161 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>4.1.2.17<br>(p. 3-5) | The Edify application version information appears to have been cut off. What is the currently installed version of Edify? What version and service pack of Windows Server 200X is the Edify system running on? | Edify 9.0<br><br>Windows 2000 - Version 5.0 Service pack 4  |
| 162 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5)             | What is the original installation date of the Edify VRU system?  | Late 1998   |
| 163 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5)             | What is the current port count and port size for the current Edify VRU system?   | There are 62 voice ports. Each port handles one call at a time.   |

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                   |   |   |
|-----|-----|-------------------|---|---|
| 164 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | The Edify application information lists “62” as a transaction volume. What transaction volume timeframe does this number represent (i.e. hourly, daily, or weekly)?                                       | “62” is the number of calls the system can handle at any given moment.  |
| 165 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | What is the serial number for the Edify system?   | Not Relevant.   |
| 166 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | What vendor currently provides service and maintenance for the current Edify system?  | Voice Technologies  |
| 167 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | Can DMAS confirm that there are three physical IBM Unix servers in the current FA environment? What kind of virtualization separates the development, testing, and production instances in these servers? | There is no virtualization. There are 3 IBM Unix servers in the current FA environment.<br>One is used for FirstDARS production environment – shared with other accounts<br>One is used for First DARS development/test environment – shared with other accounts<br>One is used to host ETL/Extract loads which retrieve data for the Preferred Drug Management System (PDMS). This is a production environment only and is shared by other accounts. |



**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                   |   |  |
|-----|-----|-------------------|---|--|
| 168 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | Can DMAS provide hardware sizing details about the Sybase Database Translator (CPU, memory, disk usage)?                      | <p>Server: Win2000 5.0.2195 SP4</p> <p>HP ProLiant DL380 G4<br/> 4 CPU Processors :<br/> x86 Family 15 Model 4 3600mhz</p> <p>Drives:<br/> C: 9.77 GB<br/> D: 193 GB</p> <p>Memory: 3 GB</p> <p>Usage:<br/> CPU up to 40%<br/> Memory – up to 1.9 GB<br/> Disk – 130 GB</p>  |
| 169 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | Can DMAS provide a breakdown of the production, test, and development hardware for the SAS, Edify, and MediCall applications? | <p>Edify and Medical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Intel based server running Windows 2000 v 5.0 sp4 – production environment only</li> <li>• 1 Intel based server running Windows 2000 v 5.0 sp4 – development/test environment only</li> <li>• Both servers are shared with other accounts</li> </ul> <p>SAS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Intel based server running Windows 2000 production environment – shared with other accounts</li> <li>• Test environment - separate server farm (3 machines) shared with all Coventry corporate SAS users</li> </ul> |

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                   |  |  |
|-----|-----|-------------------|--|--|
| 170 | EDS | 3.4.1<br>(p. 3-5) | Can DMAS break down the various Windows/Intel servers in reference 15 between physical production, test, and development hardware? | <p>3 Intel based servers, running Windows 2000 – production environment only – supporting Virginia.fhsc.com. These servers are shared with other accounts.</p> <p>1 Intel based server, running Windows 2000, production environment only – supporting vammis.fhsc.com. Server is shared with other accounts.</p> <p>1 Intel based server, running Windows 2003. development/test environment only - supporting vatest.fhsc.com. Server is shared with other accounts.</p> |
|-----|-----|-------------------|--|--|

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                         |   |  |
|-----|-----|-------------------------|---|--|
| 171 | ACS | 4.1.2.15.1<br>(p. 4-33) | <p>Will DMAS please confirm that all system-generated reports and letters produced by the MMIS and are in final print format and no manipulation is performed made by the print vendor or another FAS contracted vendor?</p> <p>If format changes are made by the print vendor, please indicate which reports/letter are reformatted and summarize the changes that are made.</p> | <p>The MMIS mailing vendor reformats all MMIS letters as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inserts the DMAS logo at the top of all letters with a portrait orientation.</li> <li>2. Inserts an additional heading line under the DMAS logo for 20 letters.</li> <li>3. Re-formats the name and address information via the use of the United States Postal Service (USPS) software to add +4 zip for all 113 letters. Compresses blank address lines (if the attention line is not used) for 80 letters.</li> <li>4. Removes the internal header control line that is sent with each letter. The control line contains specific information (e.g. letter ID, starting position of name and address, etc.) for each letter.</li> <li>5. Creates a trailer control line which occurs on the first page of a mail piece, 5/8 inch from the bottom of the form.</li> <li>6. Adds Optical Marks Read (OMR) marks to the top right of the letters for vendor internal processing.</li> <li>7. Prints a keyline at the top of the name and address for vendor and USPS providing delivery information.</li> <li>8. Prints the USPS barcode at the bottom of the address (for valid name and address combinations) providing delivery information.</li> <li>9. Produces cover sheets for letters that do not have the name and address in the standard position, <i>i.e.</i> 9 landscape oriented letters.</li> </ol> |
|-----|-----|-------------------------|---|--|

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                     |  |   |
|-----|-----|---------------------|--|---|
| 172 | EDS | 4.1.6<br>(p. 4-44)  | <p>What is the average frequency of updates to the mainframe code base, through both the ISR process and normal software refresh activities?</p> <p>What is the average frequency of updates to the client/server applications, through both the ISR process and normal software refresh activities?</p> | <p>Mainframe custom applications: Production Emergencies are handled when they occur. Scheduled production build migrations are twice a week. Production Maintenance Releases occur every two weeks. Special Track Releases are most often migrated with a production maintenance release but are date constraint driven. Routine releases are quarterly.</p> <p>Non-mainframe custom applications: Production emergencies are handled when they occur. Code migrations occur if the application was changed as part of a release development effort.</p> <p>System software refresh (all platforms): the FAS contractor is responsible for maintaining manufacturer supported product versions on all proposed platforms and COTS software. This includes planning, testing, and implementation of software/hardware refreshes. Frequency, planning, and execution will be determined by the FAS contractor.</p> |
| 173 | EDS | 6.1.1.1<br>(p. 6-1) | <p>Please clarify what is meant by converted and non-converted outpatient drugs? If it is related to the billing method whether it is based on procedure codes or NDC codes, will there be a method to know which claims are converted and which are not?</p>  | <p>Professional drug claims are submitted with a HCPCS code and the HCPCS units along with the NDC. Therefore, for a professional drug claim, the units dispensed must be converted before rebate invoicing. Institutional outpatient drug claims are submitted with either a HCPCS code and/or an NDC. When an institutional outpatient claim is submitted with only a HCPCS code, the units dispensed must be converted.</p>  |

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |  |   |   |
|-----|-----|--|---|---|
| 174 | EDS | <p>Appendix A.I<br/>(p. A.1-2)</p> <p>Table 2.2:<br/>Proposal<br/>Format, 5<sup>th</sup> row<br/>(p. 2-11)</p> | <p>Appendix A.I: Small Business Subcontracting Plan is requiring Offerors to provide “Planned Contract Dollars During Initial Period of the Contract.”</p> <p>This requirement is contradictory to the requirement in Table 2.2: Proposal Format: Detailed pricing as specified in Section 4.4, 5.4, or 6.4. Submitted in a separate envelope a hard copy file and CD. Do not include any pricing data in any other section of the proposal.</p> <p>Should Appendix A.I be included in the Cost Proposal as it is asking for pricing?</p> | <p>Yes, an Offeror’s submission of Appendix A.I: Small Business Subcontracting Plan should be included with CD-ROM No.2, Pricing, as identified under RFP Table 2.2: Proposal Format.</p> <p>Table 2.2 has been updated to reflect this change.</p> |
|-----|-----|--|---|---|

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |   |  |  |
|-----|-----|---|--|--|
| 175 | CSC | Appendix A.II<br>E. Continuous Improvement<br>(p. A.II-1) | <p>The Parties agree that Contractor shall continuously improve the Service Levels during the Term of the Agreement in accordance with this Section. Beginning 12 months after the implementation of Service Level Credits on July 1, 2010 and on each annual anniversary thereof, the Parties shall adjust the Minimum Performance Level for each Service Level so that the Improvement Adjustment for each Service Level is calculated as (the average of the six (6) highest or best monthly actual results that are above or better than the Minimum Performance Level during the preceding twelve (12) months minus the current Minimum Performance Level) multiplied by 20%. The Improvement Adjustment is then added to the current Minimum Performance Level in order to establish the new Minimum Performance Level.</p> <p>The proposed language appears to set the Contractor in conflict with Continual Quality improvement and meeting exceedingly tighter SLAs. Is DMAS willing to consider a Quality Improvement program that eliminates this conflict?</p> | <p>DMAS does not see a conflict.</p> <p>A Contractor's Continuous Quality Improvement program may very well result in recommendations to DMAS for additions/changes/deletions to specific SLAs contained in E.II, F.II, and G.II. If DMAS concurs, the SLA change mechanisms for these improvements are documented in A.II, D. CHANGES TO PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS.</p> <p>A.II, E. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT is targeted for adjusting the minimum performance level for ongoing SLAs based on history. The formula can result in EITHER tightening or loosening of the minimum performance level.</p> |
|-----|-----|---|--|--|

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |  |   |  |
|-----|-----|--|---|--|
| 176 | CSC | Appendix A.II<br>E. Continuous<br>Improvement<br>(p. A.II-4) | <p>In page A.II-4 of Appendix A, the RFP states: "The Parties agree that Contractor shall continuously improve the Service Levels during the Term of the Agreement in accordance with this Section. Beginning 12 months after the implementation of Service Level Credits on July 1, 2010 and on each annual anniversary thereof, the Parties shall adjust the Minimum Performance Level for each Service Level ..."</p> <p>We believe that COV will benefit from continuous improvement (per the formula specified in this Section of the RFP) of most of the service level targets. However, there are some service levels targets for which little-to-no benefit from continual improvement will be realized by COV; yet substantial increased costs could result if the DMAS formula for improvement were to be applied to them. An example of this is "24 x 7 system up time at 99.8% Minimum Performance." Another example is: "notification of outages to DMAS in less than 5 minutes."</p> <p>Will DMAS modify this requirement from "each Service Level" to "most Service Levels?"</p> | DMAS recognizes the point and will modify the requirement. |
|-----|-----|--|---|--|

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |        |                                     |   |  |
|-----|--------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 177 | BCBSSC | Appendix D<br>1.1.6<br>(p. D-13)    | <p>The summary of current Web functionality available and maintained by the FA includes a tutorial for Pharmacy Web Prior Authorization.</p> <p>Please clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We understand this functionality is current and maintained by the incumbent FA. Is the Pharmacy Web Prior Authorization application a requirement of this contract?</li> <li>- If so, will the Contractor take over this functionality from the current FA and maintain it, or do we need to develop a similar application?</li> </ul> | The Contractor will not need to take over this functionality or develop a similar application. The Pharmacy Web Prior Authorization application is supported under the PDL contract. |
| 178 | EDS    | Appendix E.I<br>#54<br>(p. E.I-10)  | What is the current prior authorization process for pharmacy?   | Pharmacy prior authorizations are part of a separate Prior Authorization/PDL contract. This question is not relevant to this RFP.  |
| 179 | ACS    | Appendix E.I<br>#59<br>(p. E.I-11)  | <p>“Does the Offeror agree to prepare comprehensive reporting consistent with standards and deliverables supporting the various Virginia Medicaid pharmacy programs”?</p> <p>Does the term “prepare” imply that this functionality does not exist today and must be implemented during the takeover / transition phase?</p>   | <p>The reports that support the various Virginia Medicaid pharmacy programs are generally ad hoc. See requirement E.I #78.</p> <p>The Offeror must provide the server.</p>           |
| 180 | CSC    | Appendix E.I<br>#68<br>(p. E.I -13) | <p>Req # 68 states: "Provide a software test environment that allows for end-to-end testing with potential trading partners."</p> <p>Who will provide this server, DMAS or the vendor?</p>  | The Offeror must provide the server.   |



**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |                                     |   |  |
|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 181 | EDS | Appendix E.I<br>#73<br>(p. E.I-16)  | <p>Define “timely, mass updates” on medical and administrative codes data.</p> <p>Is this process limited to the standard quarterly and annual updates?</p> <p>Is this function for batch updates only?</p> <p>What reference data will be manually entered?</p>                              | <p>A timely mass update occurs within 30 days of receipt of new and/or updated medical and administrative codes.</p> <p>No. The updates can be quarterly, annual or on demand.</p> <p>No. The function applies to batch and manual updates.</p> <p>As a rule, all updates of medical and administrative codes data are batch updates, and manual updates are an exception. Potentially all codes could be subject to manual update if, for example, individual code updates are required for which a DMAS resource is unavailable or if the batch process fails and cannot be fixed in time to accommodate the desired effective date.</p> |
| 182 | CSC | Appendix E.I<br>#160<br>(p. E.I-35) | <p>Reference: Req #160: "... provide DMAS with a Takeover organization chart including a named project manager for the Takeover Phase..."</p> <p>Question: The takeover manager is a critical position for the success of the Takeover Phase. Will DMAS designate this as a Key Position?</p> | <p>No. However, see addendum for modifications related to this position.</p>   |

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |        |   |  |   |
|-----|--------|---|--|---|
| 183 | CSC    | Appendix E.I<br>#160<br>(p. E.I-35)   | Req #160 asks: "Does the Offeror agree to provide DMAS with a Takeover organization chart including a named project manager for the Takeover Phase?" Appendix F.I Requirement #65, and Appendix G.1 Requirement #80, ask the same question. Since it is possible for one contractor to receive award of any two contracts of the RFP, we recommend that it be acceptable to DMAS that an offeror bid the same individual as the Takeover Project Manager in two or three proposals responding to this RFP. We believe this could be accomplished well by a qualified project manager, and substantial savings would accrue to DMAS as a result. Does DMAS agree to allow this? | DMAS will conduct separate and independent evaluations of each Offeror's proposal, regardless of whether the Offeror bids on multiple contracts. DMAS does not restrict an Offeror from submitting the same individual for any proposal.                              |
| 184 | BCBSSC | Appendix E.I<br>#174<br>(p. E.I-37)<br><br>Appendix E.III<br>Section L<br>(p. E.III-10) | Question 174 states, "Does the Offeror agree to accept and house existing hardcopy files? Describe the approach."<br><br>Do the volumes in Section L. Paper Document Storage represent all the hard copy files that will be transferred from the incumbent? If not, please provide other estimated volumes.<br><br>How often will these stored documents need to be retrieved or accessed?   | The volumes given represent all the hard copy files to be transferred; however, the volumes are approximate and may vary slightly at the time of the transfer.<br><br>Because images of documents are accessible, requests for actual paper documents are infrequent. |
| 185 | EDS    | Appendix E.II<br>Table E-3<br>(p. E.II-6)   | In table E-3, DMAS lists the aggregate availability of the Medicaid enterprise production environment as 99.5%. DMAS lists aggregate availability of the test and development environments as 99.8%. Is this a typographical error? If not, can DMAS elaborate on the need for a higher SLA for test than production?  | The SLA for the development environment is changed to 99.5%.  |

**Attachment 1**  
**RFP 2008-02, Addendum 5**  
**Questions and Responses**

|     |     |   |   |   |
|-----|-----|---|---|---|
| 186 | CSC | Appendix E.II<br>Table E-7<br>#14<br>(p. E.II-13) | Item # 14 states that all paper payment requests with missing key fields must be returned $\leq 48$ hours after receipt.<br><br>Will DMAS restate this target as "Return $\leq 2$ business days after receipt"?   | Yes.  |
| 187 | CSC | Appendix E.II<br>Table E-7<br>#22<br>(p. E.II-13) | Item #22: Provide hardcopy payment information $\leq 2$ working days or upon DMAS request.<br><br>Will Contractors have to provide RA copies to providers? (This is currently performed by DMAS.)   | See response to question 148 in Addendum 3.       |
| 188 | CSC | Appendix E.II,<br>Table E-8<br>(p. E.II-15)       | In the Definition section of Table E-8, General System Availability Service Levels, the RFP states that "... Availability is for the single unit and is not the availability of the aggregated servers and excludes scheduled maintenance." The RFP then includes specific Pre-Scheduled Downtime Requirements.<br><br>Table E-3, MMIS General Availability Service Levels, does not include an exclusion for scheduled maintenance related to system availability. Will DMAS please include an exclusion for pre-scheduled downtime for performance targets in Table E-3 for entries related to system availability. | Yes.  |
| 189 | CSC | Appendix F.II<br>Table F-3 #10<br>(p. F.II-3)     | Appendix F.II, Table F-3, #10: This SLA indicates that Key Personnel must be available Monday - Friday from 0800-1700 excluding state holidays and DMAS pre-approved exceptions 95% of the time. Please define the expectation of how this should be tracked and reported.  | See Section 6.3.2.2 SLA Monitoring and Reporting. |